

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on **27 December 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferchichi et al (USPub 2003/0012382, hereinafter “Ferchichi”), in view of Graham-Cumming, Jr. (USPN 6,182,146, hereinafter “Graham-Cumming”).

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ferchichi in view of Graham-Cumming. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Ferchichi and Graham-Cumming teaches comparing **timestamps on successive packets during garbage collection** to determine if an application-port mapping has expired (see Graham-Cumming, col. 7, line 55 to col. 8, line 5).

In contrast, the present invention determines if a single sign-on authentication has expired by comparing an **expiry time calculated from the time-stamped token** against a current time (see FIG. 2 and paragraph [0031] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it provides a technique which enables a single sign-on authentication to expire at a specific time. The combined system of Ferchichi and Graham-Cumming does not cause expiration until a successive packet arrives and the time difference between successive packets exceeds a timeout period. There is nothing within Ferchichi or Graham-Cumming, either separately or in concert, which suggests determining if a single sign-on authentication has expired by comparing an expiry time calculated from the time-stamped token against a current time.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to clarify that the present invention determines if a single sign-on authentication has expired by comparing an expiry time calculated from the time-stamped token


against a current time. These amendments find support in FIG. 2 and in paragraph [0031] of the instant application. Dependent claims 4, 13, and 21 have been amended to correct antecedent basis. Additionally, dependent claim 21 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17, as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that dependent claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 24 January 2006

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95616-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665  
Email: edward@parklegal.com